

THE SOLICITATION CLOSING DATE HAS BEEN EXTENDED TO THURSDAY, OCTOBER 10TH, 2013; 4:00 P.M., CENTRAL DAYLIGHT TIME (CDT)

All Offerors must acknowledge receipt of this amendment by inserting Amendment Number 04 and date in Block 14 of the original SF 33 with your proposal submission.

For conformity purposes, a new SF Form 33, Solicitation GS00Q-13-DR-0002 and Attachments J.1. through J.10. are replaced in their entirety by this Amendment 04.

This Amendment 04 addresses questions received in response to the solicitation. This amendment also provides a number of edits to the original solicitation. Offerors should review all documents and changes carefully. In accordance with FAR 15.201(f), the questions and answers being shared are questions that could potentially impact the preparation of proposals in response to the solicitations. Comments, recommendations, and other feedback/questions received have been considered, but are not included.

If your question has not yet been answered below by this Amendment it may be due to the fact that this latest Amendment answers your question by clarifying the language in the solicitation. In the event you have submitted a question pertaining to the preparation of offers that has not been addressed please re-submit those questions as soon as possible. Please review this amendment in its entirety. All future questions must pertain to this latest amendment to be considered.

Note: There may be questions below that pertain to the OASIS Unrestricted solicitation only. Please read accordingly.

THE PURPOSE OF AMENDMENT 04 IS TO:

- (1) Summarize the changes that were made to the solicitation;
- (2) Answer questions from prospective Offerors;
- (3) Re-issue a complete conformed solicitation (SF 33, Sections A through M, including all Attachments in Section J)

AMENDMENT 04 SUMMARY OF CHANGES

The following summarizes the changes to the solicitation by each section under Amendment 04, however, Offerors are advised to read the Amendment 04 solicitation and attachments in their entirety, including the Questions and Answers.

SF 33:

1. SF 33 was updated and replaced in its entirety with a fillable form.

SECTION A:

1. All terms and conditions in Section A remain unchanged.

SECTION B:

1. All terms and conditions in Section B remain unchanged.

SECTION C:

1. All terms and conditions in Section C remain unchanged.

SECTION D:

1. All terms and conditions in Section D remain unchanged.

SECTION E:

1. All terms and conditions in Section E remain unchanged.

SECTION F:

1. All terms and conditions in Section F remain unchanged.

SECTION G:

1. All terms and conditions in Section G remain unchanged.

SECTION H:

1. Section H.6.1. was updated to clarify that GSA is the cognizant federal agency that determines acceptable accounting systems for both OASIS and OASIS SB.
2. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

SECTION I:

1. All terms and conditions in Section I remain unchanged.

SECTION J:

SECTION J.1. LABOR CATEGORIES AND DEFINITIONS – Attachment (1)

1. All terms and conditions in Section J.1. remain unchanged.

SECTION J.2. DIRECT LABOR RATE RANGES – Attachment (2)

1. All terms and conditions in Section J.2. remain unchanged.

SECTION J.3. POOL QUALIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION – Attachment (3)

1. Section J.3. was updated based on Questions received. **Please use the updated attachment with your proposal**

SECTION J.4. PROPOSAL CHECKLIST – Attachment (4)

1. Section J.4. was revised in its entirety due to numerous Questions received. **Please use the updated attachment with your proposal**

SECTION J.5.1. SELF SCORING WORKSHEET FOR (PROPOSAL SUBMISSION) – Attachment (5A)

1. Section J.5.1. was updated to also allow for PSC Codes , to correct a math error in the template for CMMI scoring, and to allow points for projects valued from \$750K to \$2M. **Please use the updated attachment with your proposal**

SECTION J.5.2. SELF SCORING WORKSHEET (SAMPLE ONLY) – Attachment (5B)

1. Section J.5.2. was updated to also allow for PSC Codes , to correct a math error in the template for CMMI scoring, and to allow points for projects valued from \$750K to \$2M.

SECTION J.6. MODIFIED PRE-AWARD SURVEY (SF 1408) – Attachment (6)

1. Section J.6. was updated due to format issues. **Please use the updated attachment with your proposal**

SECTION J.7. RELEVANT EXPERIENCE (PRIMARY) TEMPLATE – Attachment (7)

1. Section J.7. was revised in its entirety due to numerous Questions received. **Please use the updated attachment with your proposal**

SECTION J.8. PAST PERFORMANCE RATING FORM – Attachment (8)

1. The Past Performance Rating Form was updated due to format issues, however if you already have a survey completed you do not have to submit a new survey. Small Business Utilization will be N/A regardless if it's been rated or not.

SECTION J.9. COST/PRICE TEMPLATE – Attachment (9)

1. All terms and conditions in Section J.9. remain unchanged.

SECTION J.10. RELEVANT EXPERIENCE (SECONDARY) TEMPLATE – Attachment (10)

1. Section J.10. was revised in its entirety based due to numerous Questions received. **Please use the updated attachment with your proposal**

SECTION K:

1. All terms and conditions in Section K remain unchanged.

SECTION L:

Offerors are strongly advised to read Section L, Amendment 04, in its entirety. The following are a general summary of changes.

1. Section L.3. was updated to add language regarding support documentation.
2. Section L.3.4. was updated to extend the due date for receipt of proposals to October 10, 2013.
3. Section L.4. Format Table has been updated and replaced in its entirety.
4. Section L.5.1.7. was updated with minor language edits regarding DCAA audit submission.
5. Section L.5.1.8. deleted language regarding optional subcontracting plans.
6. Section L.5.2.1. was updated to add language to allow GSA to clarify or request additional information on Financial Responsibility after proposal submission.
7. Section L.5.3.1. was revised to allow for a **minimum of Three (3) up to a maximum of Five (5)** Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects, to clarify past performance for projects with less than 1 year of performance, clarify a collection of task orders, and clarify the minimum value of each project depending on the number of relevant experience projects submitted.
8. Section L.5.3.2. has minor language edits.
9. Section L.5.3.2.2. added points for projects valued from \$750K to \$2M.
10. Section L.5.4. was updated regarding past performance for relevant experience projects less than 1 year.
11. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged

SECTION M:

Offerors are strongly advised to read Section M, Amendment 04, in its entirety. The following are a general summary of changes.

1. Section M.4.1. was updated to clarify that GSA is the cognizant federal agency for determining acceptable/adequate accounting systems for OASIS and OASIS SB.
2. Section M.5.1.2. was updated to add points for projects valued from \$750K to \$2M.
3. Section M.6. table was updated to clarify that NAICS and PSC Codes are in Section L.5.1.2. and to allow for points for projects valued between \$750K and \$2M.
4. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged

AMENDMENT 04 QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

The following are questions submitted in response to the solicitation that impact proposal preparation. Duplicative questions are not always repeated.

1. **Clarification:** For a MA/IDIQ contract where the contract terms preclude release of certain contract information outside of the issuing agency, is it correct to assume that submitting only a written statement from the Contracting Officer confirming that we have a MA/IDIQ contract, along with the number of TOs issued, is satisfactory for purposes of meeting the requirements of RFQ paragraph L.5.3.3.2, Relevant Experience (Secondary) Projects with Multiple Award Contracts/BPAs and Task Orders?

Response: Yes.

2. **Clarification:** L.5.4, Volume 4 – Past Performance now requires Past Performance not just on the five Relevant Experience examples but also on each Pool Qualification. The self-scoring sheet hasn't been altered in this area. Is it correct to assume that only the five Relevant Experience examples are scored?

Response: That is correct.

3. **Question:** Attachment 6, Modified Pre-Award Survey, requires the "Name, Title, and Signature of individual responsible for the design of the accounting system". Inasmuch as companies often procure systems such as an Oracle system or Deltek Cost Point, please clarify this request. Large companies often have many individuals responsible for various portions of the system. We are confused by this request as worded. Please identify if you are looking for the individual responsible for the overall compliance or integrity of the system.

Response: The intent here is to have an individual from the Contractor's organization at a level no lower than a Vice-President or Chief Financial Officer who has overall responsibility for the accounting system and can bind the contractor. At a minimum, Offerors should indicate the individual responsible for the accounting system. Please be advised, brand names do not constitute acceptable accounting systems.

4. **Question:** Modified Pre-Award Survey: These Survey items require copies of most recent audit reports/documentation and validation. How should the Contractor provide for Disclosure Statements that have been submitted but not yet audited by DCAA - therefore, no determination has been issued?

Response: If a contractor which was required to submit a Disclosure Statement to the Cognizant Federal Agency Official (CFAO) (with a copy to DCAA) did so and no determination has been issued by the CFAO, then they should provide a copy of their Disclosure Statement(s) along with proof that it was submitted to the CFAO (with a copy to DCAA) and the CFAO status update on the CFAO's determination.

5. **Question:** Modified Pre-Award Survey: This Survey item asks if our organization has been notified by DCAA that it is in (or may be in) noncompliance with its disclosure statement or CAS. Please clarify if this question relates to current practices? If not, how many years prior does it pertain to?

Response: Contractors should report any non-compliances with its Disclosure Statement and/or CAS that have not been settled/corrected. In other words, if a CFAO final determination of a non-compliance is in existence then the contractor must report it.

6. **Clarification:** Section B.2.5.1, Ceiling Rates for T&M and L-H Task Orders, states:

"The OASIS ceiling rates that are in effect at the time a task order is awarded shall remain with the task order award during the entire term of the task order, including task orders with option periods."

We are unclear as to GSA's intent with respect to this statement. As written, this statement could be construed to mean that if a task order is awarded during Year 1 of the OASIS agreement, the Contractor cannot exceed the Year 1 ceiling rates at any point during performance of a multi-year task order. Please confirm that we are correct in interpreting this statement to mean that (as an example) the Contractor's ceiling rate is not restricted to the Year 1 ceiling rates for the duration of a multi-year task order and that they can be reimbursed up to the allowable escalated ceiling rates in effect in the master agreement for each year of task order performance.

Response: That is correct. "The rates in effect at the time a task order is awarded" include the current year rates, option year rates, and/or multi-year rates. When task orders are awarded, they establish rates for the entire time of the task order.

7. **Question:** The SF33 issued with amendment 2 does not have the fields unlocked that the contractor is to fill in. Is there anyway there any way the form can be replaced on FedBizOps?

Response: In this amendment we provide a fillable SF 33.

8. **Question:**

a. In amendment 02 question 94 about project 5 it states: *"Response: For a collection of task orders, add up the obligated or estimated value of **every task order awarded under the IDIQ (not just the task orders used for identifying relevant experience and past performance)** and then divide the total by total number of months awarded or factored into the value."*

b. Section L.5.3.1 second paragraph states "For the purposes of determining the Pass/Fail requirements for Total Project Value and Total Number of Core Disciplines, **the combination of task orders submitted** under the Single-Award IDIQ or BPA will be used. (See Section L.5.3.2. for how additional points will be determined)."

c. Section L.5.3.2.2 page note states: "Note: If an Offeror submits a single project as "collection of task orders" under a Single-Award IDIQ/BPA, Project Value is based on the cumulative value of the **entire task order collection submitted** as a whole under the Single-Award IDIQ/BPA. **(If the maximum project value is achieved without submitting all the task orders that have been awarded, then only submit those task orders that achieve the maximum results for Project Value)**

d. The solicitation does not say to use the value for **every task order under the IDIQ**. Please clarify. Are offerors to use **every task awarded** under the BPA or **only the number of task orders** to achieve maximum points? An IDIQ could have hundreds of task orders.

Response: Offerors need only provide as much documentation as necessary to validate the points being claimed.

9. **Question:** When the task order award references the base period AND option periods, are we to submit the corresponding task order modifications to validate that the PoP falls within 5 years of the solicitation closing date?

Response: Any documentation that validates that information may be provided. That may be a mod, and FPDS report, or any other official form of documentation.

10. **Question:** If an extension were to be granted, would GSA consider grandfathering the Sept. 17th date as the point in time from which primary and secondary projects, and pool qualification projects must have been completed within the past five (5) years?

Response: Yes. The 5 year time limit will be determined based upon the original solicitation close date of September 17, 2013.

11. **Clarification:** You probably have already received some feedback on this, but wanted to highlight that the scoring table in the RFP and the worksheets in J.5.1 and J.5.2 seem to be a little out of sync. Still reviewing to ensure we haven't missed some detail, but looks like one delta is the addition of the PSC code as part of the scoring element in L.5.3.2.1 and related format change. It's missing in the worksheets/attachments.

Response: These worksheets have been updated to allow for PSC Codes in lieu of NAICS Codes as part of the scoring element in Section L.5.3.2.1.

12. **Question:** Under the new Section L.4 Proposal Format, Pool Qualification Projects Past Performance Validation has been moved to Section L.5.4. Under the new naming convention provided in this section, the "Project Number" reference was omitted. Since three projects are required for each Pool, do we assume that the naming should be corrected to provide the "Project Number" as well? We suggest the following:

ABC.VOL4.PQ.PP.P1.P1.pdf
(Company, Volume, Pool Qualification, Past Performance, Pool 1, **Project 1**) Repeat as many times necessary.
ABC.VOL4.PQ.PP.P1.P2.pdf
ABC.VOL4.PQ.PP.P1.P3.pdf
ABC.VOL4.PQ.PP.P2.P1.pdf
ABC.VOL4.PQ.PP.P2.P2.pdf
ABC.VOL4.PQ.PP.P2.P3.pdf
ABC.VOL4.PQ.PP.P3.pdf
ABC.VOL4.PQ.PP.P4.pdf
ABC.VOL4.PQ.PP.P5A.pdf
ABC.VOL4.PQ.PP.P5B.pdf
ABC.VOL4.PQ.PP.P6.pdf

If we do not add the identifier for each project under a pool, should we roll the 3 documents for each pool into a single file?

Response: Please use the project identifier. We've updated Section L.4. under this amendment. Please note that the Table is a guideline to assist Offerors and that the primary goal is to ensure the government can easily identify which documents apply to which criteria for evaluation purposes.

- 13. Question:** For the CMMI Level 3 appraisal and approval issued by the lead appraiser on our particular submission, no CMMI certificate was issued by the Software Engineering Institute and we have confirmed one will not be issued by the CMMI Institute. The PARS is the primary method of providing proof of official certification approved by this organization. Will the Government reconsider allowing PARS showing CMMI certification given CMMI certificates provided in another format are issued by an organization other than the SEI or CMMI Institute?

Response: If your CMMI appraisal is located in PARS and is verifiable, we will allow PARS. If you can print out the PARS information, please submit that.

- 14. Question:** In the Relevant Experience Secondary projects for Multiple Award Contracts/BPAs and Task Orders (L.5.3.3.2) and Mission Spaces (L.5.3.3.1) sections, we are to identify the date the "Contracting Officer awarded/signed" the official government award forms listed (e.g. SF, DD or GSA). We have obtained the required forms listed to demonstrate experience and in reviewing our verification documentation, the Contracting Officer did not date their signatures on some of the forms. Will the government accept the "date of order information" (i.e. Box #2 on DD115 and Box #1 on GSA 300 forms), "effective date" (i.e. Box #3 on SF 26 forms) or its equivalent with other official government award forms to ensure the project was completed within the past five years prior to the solicitation date or is ongoing?

Response: Yes, the effective date is the primary date for determining the period of performance.

- 15. Clarification:** RFP Section L.5.1.2.3, 5th bullet requires "further evidence to support the Exception(s)... (such as the Statement of Work)", and RFP Section L.5.1.2.4 requires "verification documentation for Exclusions on each project". In the revised Proposal Format Table released at Amend 2, there are no longer filenames associated with submitting this information. Request GSA provide a filename convention for submitting this documentation in the applicable Pool Qualification projects. For example, recommend, "ABC.VOL1.PQ.VERIFDOC.P3" for Pool 3, and repeat as necessary for P5A, P5B, and P6.

Response: We've updated Section L.4. under this amendment to include a file name for NAICS Code or PSC Code verification under each Pool. Please note that the Table is a guideline to assist Offerors and that the primary goal is to ensure the government can easily identify which documents apply to which criteria for evaluation purposes.

- 16. Question:** To clarify, for the Single-award IDIQ entry, is Total Project Value calculated based on ALL task orders cumulatively rolled up under the IDIQ vehicle, or is it calculated solely on the subset of task orders (up to 6) that are selected for OASIS SB?

Response: The Total Project Value is based on the cumulative value of ALL task orders awarded under the IDIQ vehicle.

- 17. Question:** OASIS SB Amendment 3, Paragraph L.5.3.1 states: "The combined annual value of the Five (5) projects must be equal to or greater than \$3.75 Million per year. No Individual Annual Project Value shall be less than \$150,000 per year. Note: Annual project value for completed projects is determined as follows: total obligated dollars divided by the total number of months of performance multiplied by 12. Annual project value for ongoing projects is determined as follows: total estimated value (inclusive of all option periods) divided by the total number of months of performance (inclusive of all option periods) multiplied by 12. If

One (1) of the projects is a "collection of task orders" placed under a Single-Award IDIQ task order contract or Single-Award BPA, each task order will be calculated based on the formulas above."

However, the corresponding Amendment 3, Attachment 7 file name:

Section_J.7.,_Att._(7),_Amendment_03,_OASIS_SB_Relevant_Experience_(PRIMARY)_Template, was not updated to reflect the new lower average annual dollar value of relevant experience projects acceptable for scoring purposes. Recommend the attachment be updated/amended to reflect the new pass/fail criteria from \$150,000<\$2,000,000.

Response: Section J.7. has been updated in this amendment to reflect this.

- 18. Question:** The change in the average annual dollar lower limit to \$150,000 for relevant past performance projects as reflected in OASIS SB, Amendment 3, Paragraph L.5.3.1 is a significant change to the RFP and has major impact to proposal strategies for those competing companies. Much time and effort has already been expended to meet the previous criteria and maximize our scores based on the complex scoring methodology proposed by the Government. In addition, the numerous changes brought on by the three amendments require considerable manpower and time for each company to review to ensure we provide a fully compliant and responsive proposal that will meet the Government requirements. Will GSA consider an extension for the proposal due date to the end of Sep 2013 to ensure companies have a fair and reasonable time to provide a fully compliant and responsive proposal?

Response: This amendment reflects an extension to the due date.

- 19. Question:** For OASIS SB, J.7 Form, number 2 asks ". What is the ANNUAL AVERAGE DOLLAR VALUE PER YEAR of the project? ". The lowest possible answer is \$750,000< 2Million. However, page 108 of solicitation (amendment 3) suggests an acceptable amount that is lower than \$750,000 when stating "No Individual Annual Project Value shall be less than \$150,000 per year". In the situation of a \$200,000 annual project value, how should this J.7 form question be answered if the highest possible answer is \$750,000< 2 Million?

Response: Section J.7. has been updated in this amendment to reflect this.

- 20. Question:** Our company has a completed a project the meets a NAICS code for Pool 1, but the Contract Officer did not fill in the NAICS Code on our documentation. What is the best way to prove our NAICS Code qualification so we can qualify this project?

Response: The FPDS entry is the official document that captures the NAICS or PSC Code. If not in FPDS, check the solicitation document and award document. If none of those documents identify a NAICS or PSC code, then ask the contracting officer for a statement as to what the applicable codes are. If in FPDS, there must not be a conflict with other documentation unless the Contracting Officer corrects the NAICS or PSC Code by letter.

- 21. Question:** Attachment J4, Volume I, Pool Qualification and Certification #2 does not seem to require the CPARS justification, where in the Solicitation, Pg 89, Volume 4, L.5.4 Pool Qualification Projects now requires CPARS according to the table. However, within Section L, L.5.1.2 (page 95) requires CPARS validation as well as in L.5.4 (pg 116-117).

Does the Government require CPARS to be included in both Volume 1 and in Volume 4 for the Pool Qualification Projects?

Response: By this amendment, we moved all Pool Qualification and Relevant Experience (Primary) past performance to volume 4 only. See updated Table in Section L.4.

- 22. Question:** In Section L.4 Proposal Format for Volume 3 Sections L.5.3.1. – L.5.3.2.8. Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects, three different naming systems are provided:
- 1) Documents validating the information submitted in Section J.7. Attachment (7);
 - 2) "Agreements"; and
 - 3) NAICS Code or PSC Code Validation.

Validation of 2) and 3) are clearly defined below:

"Agreements" (if necessary) – Validation of change of names, mergers, etc. (naming clearly provided as ABC.VOL3.REPP1.A.pdf)
FPDS-NG Reports – Validation of NAICS Code (naming clearly provided as ABC.VOL3.REPP1.CODES.pdf)

However, for the purposes of validating 1) All of the information submitted in Section J.7. Attachment (7), the following documents must be submitted:

SF33 – Validating Contract Award

SF30 with CLINS – Validating Period of Performance (POP); Annual Average Dollar Value Per Year (Dollar Value); and Contract Type (FFP, CP, etc.)

Subcontracting/Teaming Document – Validating subcontracting/teaming performed

Statement of Work (SOW)/Performance Work Statement (PWS) – Validating Core Discipline Areas; OCONUS work; Ancillary Support Services; Ancillary Support Products; and Multiple Locations

A clear naming convention for these files has not been identified. Are we to assume all of these documents are to be rolled into a single file called out as ABC.VOL3.REPP1.pdf?

Or may we suggest the following:

ABC.VOL3.REPP1.AF.pdf (Company, Volume, Relevant Experience Primary Project 1, Award Form.pdf) for SF33 Validation of Contract Award

ABC.VOL3.REPP1.CT.pdf (Company, Volume, Relevant Experience Primary Project 1, Contract Terms.pdf) for SF30 with CLINS or other appropriate documentation for validation of POP, Dollar Value and Contract Type

ABC.VOL3.REPP1.SUB.pdf (Company, Volume, Relevant Experience Primary Project 1, Subcontracting.pdf) for Subcontracting/Teaming Documents validating subcontracting/teaming performed

ABC.VOL3.REPP1.CD.pdf (Company, Volume, Relevant Experience Primary Project 1, Contract Documentation.pdf) for SOW/PWS or other appropriate contract documentation validating Core Disciplines, OCONUS work, Ancillary Support Services, Ancillary Support Products and Multiple Locations
Repeat as necessary to provide documentation for the five Relevant Experience Primary Projects.

ABC.VOL3.REPP2.AF.pdf

ABC.VOL3.REPP2.CT.pdf

ABC.VOL3.REPP2.SUB.pdf

ABC.VOL3.REPP2.CD.pdf

ABS.VOL3.REPP2.A.pdf

ABC.VOL3.REPP2.CODES.pdf

Etc.

Response: We've updated Section L.4. under this amendment. Some contracts have all the information within the contract itself, some do not. There are too many combinations and scenarios to foresee or

account for every possible situation. Usually, all of the minimum requirements and additional points for Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects can be found throughout different pages of the contract or task order award document. Please roll up all the information and validation for meeting the minimum requirements and scoring elements under a single file name, however, if it becomes too cumbersome for your particular circumstance, please note that the Table is a guideline to assist Offerors and that the primary goal is to ensure the government can easily identify which documents apply to which criteria for evaluation purposes.

- 23. Question:** Re: small business size and utilization of affiliate capabilities; Section L.5.1.9, p 98. If a small business elects to submit a meaningful relationship commitment letter and utilize affiliate quals (Per Sec L.5.1.9), will the assessment/certification of its business size (and pool eligibility) then be determined per 13 CFR 121 to include affiliate revenue and/or number employees? If so – does GSA intend to exempt ANCs, Tribally Owned, and HNO corporations or subsidiaries from size affiliation based on 13 CFR 121 (B)(2)(ii)?

Response: In accordance with 13 CFR 121, business size determination will not include affiliate qualifications for OASIS SB. Please bear in mind, however, that affiliates may only be linked to ONE Offeror. In other words, the same ANC conglomerate or parent company cannot sponsor or be listed as an affiliate for multiple OASIS SB Offerors in accordance with Section L.5.1.9. If the same ANC parent company or affiliate is linked to more than one OASIS SB Offeror, all Offerors claiming that affiliation will be disqualified.

- 24. Clarification:** Re: cross teaming at the task order level; Section H.13.3,. Please confirm that per section H.13.3 – provided no OCI exists, an OASIS prime vendor may subcontract to another OASIS prime vendor at the task order level. If so – please also confirm that this would include allowing an affiliate (per Sec L.5.1.9) of an OASIS prime vendor to subcontract in similar fashion.

Response: Confirmed. Task order solicitations may place restrictions on subcontracting, but the OASIS and OASIS SB contract does not. Please bear in mind, however, that any signs of OCI or collusion could result in Dormant Status and/or off-ramping.

- 25. Clarification:** Please confirm that “further evidence to support the Exception(s)... (such as the Statement of Work)”, and “verification documentation for Exclusions on each project” is not required if the respective pool qualification project is in the applicable NAICS code and PSC code such that the combination of both provides clear evidence of work performed in the Exception (Ref last Q&A #102). For example, three (3) pool qualification projects are submitted for Pool 5B, each in NAICS 541712 and PSC Code AC25 as reported & verified in FPDS-NG. Would these projects be considered as acceptable without any further evidence or documentation of work performed in Exception C?

Response: Confirmed. This example would require no further evidence.

- 26. Clarification:** Please confirm that if the NAICS and PSC code combination (referenced above) is not adequate to justify work performed in the Exception (for pools 3, 5A, 5B, and 6), further supporting evidence is required (i.e., highlighted SOW). For example, three (3) pool qualification projects are submitted for Pool 3, each in NAICS 541330 but the PSC Codes are R414. The NAICS is correct; however, more evidence is required (i.e., highlighted SOW) to support work performed in one of the three Exceptions listed under NAICS 541330.

Response: Confirmed.

27. Question: Below is our question about the Form 527.

Amendment 02 RFP, bullet 3 under Section III Financial Statements and Section IV Income Statements of L.5.2.1. Financial Resources, states the following: "Make sure that the full name of the legal bidding entity or parent is in the heading of the financial statements." If the bidding legal entity is included in the parent company's consolidated financial statements, do we need to provide financial statements for the legal bidding entity, if the legal bidding entity is not named in the consolidated financials?

Response: Each case varies in a corporate structure. The financial analyst may need to provide guidance to each contractor on a case by case basis during the evaluation stage. An Offeror will not be found non-responsive in case something is overlooked in proposal submission. There is standard response to this question.

28. Question: *"Failure to attain the expected number of task order awards or estimated value prior to the exercise of Option I may result in a Contractor being Off-Ramped (See Section H.16.)."* How will GSA be able to guarantee that there would be adequate opportunities for an OASIS contractor to submit a bid. With up to 80 total bidders/pool, would GSA consider a period of time before section H.11.5 becomes part of the final contract?

Response: We cannot guarantee a number of solicitations, but feel that there will be many. The requirement identified is intended to ensure vendors remain active on the contracts. We can assure you that we will examine all elements involved when it is time to exercise options. The number of task orders/value is not the only determining factor.

29. Question: Section L.5.3, Paragraph 3 (number 1.) – The "RELEVANT EXPERIENCE (PRIMARY) PROJECT TEMPLATE" requires the name and contact info for the reference(s) who can verify data. What if the cognizant Contracting Officer's Representative is no longer available, e.g., retired, reassigned, etc.? Can we submit contact information for a COR that has retired from the federal government?

Response: No. A retired employee will not have access to the necessary records and documentation to verify the submitted data.

30. Question: Section M.5.1.4, Paragraph No. 3. This section of the RFP defines multiple locations based on the DoL BLS table of Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan areas. In the delivery of projects for clients, our work is performed both at the client project locations and at our office locations. Please clarify whether all locations where work is performed are eligible for consideration under M.5.1.4 with the appropriate documentation?

Response: Places of performance need to be identified in contract documentation. If the contract does not specifically identify a place of performance, then you need to get a statement from the contracting officer clarifying what the places of performance are.

31. Question: Section M.5.1.8 provides for additional points for OCONUS projects. However, Section M.5.1.4, Lines 4-5 state that "Anything OCONUS will be considered a single location at the Metropolitan city level." This effectively penalizes the use of OCONUS projects as one of our 5 primary projects. We plan to include Primary Projects that have involved work at multiple OCONUS locations. Given that OASIS will be used to deliver projects throughout CONUS and OCONUS, we request that additional points be awarded for multiple OCONUS locations under M.5.1.4.

Response: We think you may be misunderstanding the language in this instance. We allow for multiple OCONUS locations. The "city level" distinction means that multiple OCONUS locations must be in different OCONUS cities. For example, if Rome, Italy and Venice, Italy are places of performance, that is counted as 2 places of performance and both are OCONUS.

32. **Question:** We expect to have CMMI Certification on 4 October 2013. Should/can we provide preliminary certification documents for initial submittal?

Response: This should be a moot point since the due date has been extended.

33. **Question:** Do we have the option to provide updated paperwork / a modification to our proposal once final paperwork is received?

Response: No.

34. **Clarification:** Reference Section L.5.4. This RFP section was modified to now to include a requirement to provide a PPIRS/CPARS or a Past Performance Survey for the pool qualification projects within Volume 4, Past Performance. The version of Section J.3, Attachment 3 from the amendment includes the following statement: "The Offeror must include all verification documents such as FPDS-NG reports, past performance information, and other additional verification documentation specified in Section L.5.1.2 in the Volume 1 folder of your proposal submission. There are no page limitations for these documents. See Section L.4 for file naming instructions." Given the new requirement at L.5.4 regarding past performance information for pool qualification projects, we believe that this Volume I Attachment (Section J.3, Attachment 3) should be modified to remove the requirement for "past performance information" from within the form. In addition, the criteria at L.5.1.2 still includes the statement that each pool qualification project "must have a past performance rating of 3.0 or higher". Please clarify as to whether or not past performance information (PPIRS/CPARS or a Past Performance Survey) is considered to be among the "additional verification documentation specified in Section L.5.1.2" that is required for inclusion with Section J.3, Attachment 3 in Volume 1.

Response: This amendment clarifies that all past performance information is to be found in Volume 4 for both Pool Qualification Projects and Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects.

35. **Clarification:** Reference Section L.5.3.3. In regard to both the Relevant Experience (Secondary) Projects with Mission Spaces and Relevant Experience (Secondary) Projects with Multiple Award Contracts/BPAs and Task Orders there is a requirement that "Each Multiple Contract or BPA or Task Order must have been completed within the past Five (5) years prior to the solicitation closing date; or, be ongoing." The instructions at L.4 refer to providing a "Copy of Official Government Award Forms for Multiple Award Contracts/BPAs and associated Task Orders or other verification that identifies the Prime Contractor, U.S. Federal Government Agency, date of Contracting Officer signature" with L.5.3.3. through L.5.3.3.2 only referring to the various Standard Forms as the submittal documents. Please identify what submittal documentation, if any, is required for validating that the Relevant Experience (Secondary) Projects with Mission Spaces and Relevant Experience (Secondary) Projects with Multiple Award Contracts/BPAs and Task Orders meet the requirement that "Each Multiple Contract or BPA or Task Order must have been completed within the past Five (5) years prior to the solicitation closing date; or, be ongoing."

Response: The Award Form should have the effective date of the award. If not, please provide other contractual documentation that verifies the effective date of the award.

- 36. Question:** Reference Amendment 02 Q&A No. 228; RFP Section L.5.1.7. Modified Pre-Award Survey (SF 1408). We understand from the answer provided to this question pertaining to accounting system audit reports that we are to provide what documentation we have and DCAA will verify it, and that GSA believes that no change is necessary to Section J.6, Attachment (6). The current requirement in Attachment 6 and RFP Section L.5.1.7 is that if an Offeror's Accounting System has been audited by the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), CPA/Consultant, or other Cognizant Federal Agency other than DCAA, the Offeror must provide their most current audit of their Accounting System (For example, Attachment 6 states "Has your organization's Accounting System ever been audited by DCAA? If yes, the Offeror MUST attach a copy of their most recent DCAA audit report to this Modified Pre-Award Survey"). Based on the answer provided to the referenced question, we believe that the current solicitation requirements would require revision to require submittal of what documentation has been provided to the offeror by DCAA/DCMA, with recognition that this may not be the accounting system audit report, but may only be the resulting system approval letter. In any case, please confirm that the submittal of what documentation we do have and which may not include the accounting system audit report would deem an offeror as being responsive to the solicitation requirements. As background, 32 CFR Part 290.7 indicates that "Audit reports prepared by DCAA are the property of and are prepared for the use of DoD contracting officers. As a result, their release should be at the sole discretion of the DoD contracting activity."

Response: Submit the modified Pre-Award Survey and other documentation you have and are authorized to submit and DCAA will use that information to verify the status of the accounting system and to make a determination if a follow on audit is necessary. If there is a question whether or not you are authorized to release an audit, you should confirm with your DCAA representative.

- 37. Question:** Reference Amendment 02 Q&A No. 220 and 221; RFP Section L.5.1.7. Modified Pre-Award Survey (SF 1408). We understand that from the answers provided to these questions that we are to address any non-compliance issues pertaining to "current" practices. Further, that if the submitted Disclosure Statements have not yet been audited by DCAA, then we are not required to submit audit reports. The current requirement in Attachment 6 and RFP Section L.5.1.7 is that if an Offeror is subject to CAS (48 CFR Chapter 99), then "the Offeror MUST provide a copy of their most recent audit reports/documentation regarding all CAS compliance or non-compliance issues to this Modified Pre-Award Survey". Based on the answer provided to the referenced question, we believe that the current solicitation requirements would require revision to require submittal of what documentation has been provided to the offeror by DCAA/DCMA, if any, with recognition that this may not be the Disclosure Statement audit report. In any case, please confirm that the submittal of what documentation we do have, if any, and which may not include the Disclosure Statement audit report would deem an offeror as being responsive to the solicitation requirements. As background, 32 CFR Part 290.7 indicates that "Audit reports prepared by DCAA are the property of and are prepared for the use of DoD contracting officers. As a result, their release should be at the sole discretion of the DoD contracting activity."

Response: Confirmed. An Offeror will not be found non-responsive if a particular document is not authorized for release. Please keep in mind that for OASIS and OASIS SB that GSA will be the Cognizant Federal Agency for determining the adequacy of the Offerors accounting system in consultation with DCAA.

- 38. Clarification:** Is a Purchase Order and associated invoice sufficient to validate an active subcontractor for a Primary Project reference?

Response: If it identifies the project, yes.

- 39. Clarification:** On OASIS-SB, Volume 2 appears to require a complete 'Section K' of Reps & Certs.

The government has pre-checked that paragraph (d) does NOT apply, and therefore each offeror must fill in this paperwork.

These items are all covered in the SAM certifications.

Will OASIS allow the SAM certifications to suffice?

If paper is needed, can we provide a printout of that as part of our OASIS submission, in lieu of the 'RC' document?

Response: Because of the Pool Qualifications and GSA 552.203-72 is unique to OASIS and OASIS SB we prefer that all offeror's use our specific Section K since SAM may not have all the necessary information that we are looking for.

- 40. Clarification:** Amendment #3 stated that there is no need for the rating organization to rate item #6 on the Past Performance Rating sheet, Small Business Utilization.

However, there may be some reasons that the rating organization chooses to rate that element. For instance, if there was subcontracting, and the Prime either stayed within the Limitations clause (or not!), or acquired additional socio-economic credits for the agency by utilizing other qualified companies.

If the rater does in fact provide a score, will this be used by the OASIS evaluation team as part of the averaging exercise? Or, will the OASIS team simply ignore all scores for this element?

Response: Amendment 03 removed item #6 from Past Performance altogether for OASIS SB only. If you have past performance surveys on OASIS SB that were completed prior to Amendment 03 with item #6 was scored, you do not have to redo them, however, item #6 will not be used (i.e, neutral score) for determining your overall past performance score. Since the original form did not contain the element, we will ignore any scoring for that particular question.

- 41. Clarification:** OASIS SB, Paragraph L.6.1, "Direct Labor Rates" and Section J.2, Attachment (2), "OASIS DIRECT LABOR RATE RANGES," pages 1 - 3: _In both Final RFPs, Section L.6.1 says that—for each OASIS labor category in Section J.2—the BLS maps a SOC with "...a National 50th Percentile estimate, a National 75th Percentile estimate, and a National 90th Percentile estimate for direct labor rates..." However, the Junior categories' Low DL rates seem to be based on the BLS National data's mean averages rather than the 50th percentile (median) wage averages. Question: Please confirm whether the Junior categories' Low DL rates should be based on the hourly mean wages as shown.

Response: That is correct. The Junior category is based on the Mean, not the Median.

- 42. Clarification:** OASIS SB, Paragraph L.5.3.2.2. Relevant Experience (Primary) Project Value, Section J.7, Attachment 7 (Item 2), and others. The annual value of a contract is not always easily demonstrated by one entry on a single document. Values provided in FPDS and PPIRS are not always current or correct. Request that the GSA provide a text box in Item 2 of Attachment 7 to allow offerors to provide the current correct contract value and an explanation of annual value calculations, and to point GSA to the document(s) which substantiate these calculations.

Response: Thank you for the recommendation. This has been included in the new attachment J.7. in this amendment.

- 43. Clarification:** OASIS SB, Paragraph L.5.4.1. Past Performance: “For any of the Five (5) relevant experience (primary) projects submitted under Paragraph L.5.3.1., if the Government has interim or final ratings in PPIRS, the Offeror shall provide a copy of this rating with their proposal.” Question: On one of our IDIQ contracts, there is a one-to-one correlation between CPARs and Task Orders, according to the Period of Performance. The CPARS reports do not, however, include the Task Order number. As instructed, we will submit the CPAR which corresponds to the selected TO with our proposal. Should any additional notation/explanation be provided with our proposal since this will not be the most recent CPAR available for the IDIQ in PPIRS?

Response: Nothing additional is necessary. We will validate the information received.

- 44. Clarification:** Section L.5.3.2.1. “Relevant Experience (Primary) Project under an OASIS SB NAICS Code or PSC Code”, was modified to provide additional points if the Relevant Experience Projects utilized specific PSC codes. SECTION J.7. RELEVANT EXPERIENCE (PRIMARY) TEMPLATE – Attachment (7) was not updated to include the PSC code under the section entitled “RELEVANT EXPERIENCE PROJECT 1 – SCORING RELATED INFORMATION”, item 1. “Was the project solicited under or reported under a NAICS code?” Please update attachment 7 to add additional points for the PSC Code. Additionally, in Attachment 5 (a) and (b), Self Scoring Worksheet, the same question “Is EACH Project reported under any NAICS code identified in Section H.4.2.?” needs to be updated to include “or PSC Code”.

Response: We have updated Attachment J.7. and Attachment 5(a) and (b) to include PSC Codes.

- 45. Clarification:** If GSA keeps the current qualification system of a combined annual value of \$3.75M with a minimum annual project value of at least \$150k, you will have to modify SECTION J.7. RELEVANT EXPERIENCE (PRIMARY) TEMPLATE – Attachment (7) under the section entitled “RELEVANT EXPERIENCE PROJECT 1 – SCORING RELATED INFORMATION”, item 2. “2. What is the ANNUAL AVERAGE DOLLAR VALUE PER YEAR of the project?”

Response: See amended Attachment J.7.

- 46. Clarification:** Please confirm that, if the cost proposal is within the range of the Government provided Attachment J.2 direct labor rates with an indirect rate from a forward pricing rate agreement and a profit of 7%, the loaded hourly labor (ceiling) rates will be considered Fair and Reasonable for the purpose of evaluation cost/price to make a contract award regardless of the actual dollar value of the rates themselves.

Response: That is correct.

- 47. Clarification:** Please confirm that GSA will not be evaluating a bidder’s labor category ceiling rates with an IGCE, data collected from market research and/or other bidders’ labor category pricing.

Response: We will strictly implement the source selection procedures as stated in the solicitation, which is a Highest Technically Rated with Fair and Reasonable pricing approach.

- 48. Clarification:** Please clarify the applicability of the proposed ceiling rates for Task Order RFQs competed among the awarded contract holders with the expectation of adequate competition—in this case are the proposed IDIQ ceiling rates not applicable and the task order rates/costs proposed in response to the task order RFQ would be in accordance with the instructions and evaluation criteria in the Task Order RFQ?

Response: That is correct.

- 49. Clarification:** Our largest previous experience project is for 42 million for the ARMY and have been awarded 23 task orders. We believe this project best demonstrates our past performance. The NAICS code (541511) is not in the acceptable list of PRIMARY experience. Will this NAICS Code be permissible as a SECONDARY past performance or is NAICS code not a factor for the SECONDARY?

Response: NAICS codes do not apply to Secondary Relevant Experience projects. NAICS Codes or PSC Codes apply to Pool Qualification Projects and for additional points for Relevant (Experience) Primary Projects.

- 50. Clarification:** The 5 Primary Past Performance projects must include 3/6 core disciplines for OASIS SB. Does each project need to meet 3/6 or must all 5 projects cover at least 3 core disciplines?

Response: Each project must incorporate 3 out of the 6 core disciplines as defined in Section C of the solicitation. Please use the definitions provided and not the samples in Section C.

- 51. Question:** The proposal forms attached to the OASIS solicitation (dated 30 August 2013) don't allow for clear linkages between all required data items in the forms (i.e., Attachments J.4, J.7, etc.) and the documents needed to validate them. For large programs, these linkages are complex.

Due to both sets of answers to bidder questions and updated format changes caused considerable rework to ongoing proposal preparations. We believe more clarifying changes are needed.

To ensure clear and fair proposal evaluations, we hereby request that GSA open a dialog on the response format issues prior to the closing date of the solicitation.

Accordingly, to fully address the issue, we respectfully ask the Government to **extend the proposal due date to 24th September 2013**.

Response: This amendment extends the due date of proposals.

- 52.** Please see the following question on the OASIS Solicitation GS00Q-13-DR-0001:

Solicitation Passage: L.4 Proposal Format Table and L.5.1.2 Pool Application and Certification Fifth bullet "If an offeror is applying for Pools 3, 5.A., 5.B., and 6...since the FPDS-NG report does not capture the NAICS code exception(s) the offeror must submit further evidence to support the exception(s). For example, the offeror must submit evidence from the project itself, such as the statement of work..."

Question: The proposal format table does not provide example file names for the evidence (statement of work) supporting the exception(s). What file name format should the offeror use for evidence (statement of work) supporting the exception(s)?

Response: See updated L.4. for L.5.1.2. There is a file name for each Pool Qualification Project by Pool. Whatever documents are necessary to validate a NAICS or PSC Code should be under one file name per project per pool.

- 53. Question:** I am currently working on a proposal for the OASIS Small Business Solicitation and I have a question regarding the new Amendment 3:

Will there be a change to form J.5.1. self-scoring sheet L.5.3.2.2. that indicates the minimum awarded points option is between 2million and 4 million as a result of the new amendment indicating the new previous experience project minimum is \$150,000 (average of \$750,000)?

Response: Please see the amended attachment.

- 54. Question:** After reviewing the posted Question and Answers for OASIS, I can't find an answer to my question regarding the new amendment 3 changes to attachment J.5.1.

My question : The self-scoring sheet J.5.1. section L.5.3.2.2. does not allow self-scoring for projects less than 2 million; however, the new amendment changes to the solicitation indicate a new previous experience project minimum of \$150,000 as long as the aggregate projects value equals 3.75 million. Is the J.5.1. self-scoring sheet going to be amended to reduce the 2 million minimum to the new minimum of \$150,000 or the average of \$750,000?

Response: There are no points for meeting the minimum requirements. The self scoring worksheet has now been updated.

- 55. Clarification:** OASIS SB Amendment 03 updated Section L.5.3.1 (page 108, 2nd bullet) to include ongoing projects with a start date of at least 1 year of performance through 9/30/2013, but it also removed the ability to cite ongoing projects with less than 1 year of performance with a past performance assessment in CPARS.

Response: There is no change here. See amended language with added clarification.

- 56. Question:**

Since highlighting text in various document types can make the text a little more difficult to read when printed on paper, can you please let us know if GSA OASIS proposal volumes be reviewed electronically or will the provided documents be printed out and reviewed?

Response: The primary way will be to review everything electronically but, there may be instances where we need to print it out too.

- 57. Question:** In the form J3 provide more space for the Contractor to provide more detail.

In the J7 form the Government needs to provide a space for an explanation for the annual dollar value for the year of the project.

In the J10 form the Government needs to provide space for contract identification with linkage to the attachments.

In general anywhere a file is required to identify a piece of information we would like space on the form to identify the file.

Response: Section J.7. has been updated to allow this. Section J.3. includes all file identifiers.

- 58. Question:** Please confirm that documentation of the sale (e.g., Board of Directors resolution, stock purchase agreement, SEC filing) is sufficient to show ownership of a contract held by a former subsidiary or affiliate for a specific period under L.3.2.

Response: Confirmed.

- 59. Question:** Attachment J3 states "The Offeror must include all verification documents such as FPDS-NG reports, past performance information, and other additional verification documentation specified in Section L.5.1.2 in the Volume 1 folder of your proposal submission. There are no page limitations for these documents. See Section L.4 for file naming instructions." Section L.4 Proposal Format Table does not include a naming convention for Volume 1 L.5.1.2 Past Performance Documents. Should we use the same naming convention as Volume 4 for Past Performance or only include the Past Performance within Volume 4?

Response: Only include Past Performance in Volume 4. See previous responses to this question.

- 60. Clarification:** Our firm is confused with regard to the answer to question 134. Of the five citations we are submitting that demonstrate past performance relevancy that aligns with the NAICS codes, all are with a Prime contractor that holds the master contract at the IDIQ level. That is, we were awarded contracts as a subcontractor to the prime on an IDIQ contract vehicle.

Are we eligible to submit a response that will be evaluated?

Response: We are not considering subcontractor experience for OASIS awards. However, there is an on-ramp process. Throughout the life of the contract, we will be adding companies. So while your company may not be eligible now, your company will have a solid roadmap of what would need to be done in order to get on the contract in the future.

- 61. Clarification:** RFP Section L.4 Proposal Format, subsection Proposal Format Table (page 92) does not have a Novation Agreements section for Volume 4 Past Performance. Should the Novation Agreements for these projects be included in the Past Performance validation documentation or should the Novation Agreements be provided as separate documents with a separate file name (i.e. ABC.VOL4.PQ.PP.A.P1 or ABC.VOL4.REPP1.PP.A).

Response: Since the past performance information is linked to the Relevant Experience Projects, there shouldn't be a need for a duplicate novation agreements. The novation agreements provided in Volume 3 should cover the past performance information provided in Volume 4.

- 62. Clarification:** For Contractors with a CACO, is attaching a copy of the CACO letter approving the Contractor's Accounting System responsive to the requirement of Section L.5.1.7. Modified Pre-Award Survey (SF 1408) and Section J.6 Attachment (6) Question 1?

Response: Yes. .

- 63. Clarification:** Our company has made an acquisition and is currently in the process of novating contracts associated with this acquisition.
Is it acceptable to provide Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters for each contract for which novation is not yet completed?

Response: No.

- 64. Clarification:** Is providing the above explanation and Point of Contact information for a Contractor's DCMA CACO in response to L.5.5.2. – Forward Pricing Rate Agreements, Forward Pricing Rate Recommendations, and/or Approved Billing Rates, sufficient to claim credit for this scoring element?

Response: If they will validate the information, that will be fine.

- 65. Clarification:** Section L.5.3.3.2, Relevant Experience (Secondary) Projects with Multiple Award Contracts/BPAs and Task Orders – pg 114 – The current documentation requirements are the Multiple Award Contract award form and associated Task Order award forms. Please confirm that you do not require any additional supporting documentation for multiple award verification.

Response: Confirmed.

- 66. Clarification:** The Government asks for the offeror to provide primary and alternate references. In the parentheses to this requirement the Government requests a "person who can verify the data - Government Contracting Officer or Contracting Officer Representative." Does the reference need to be a Government Contracting Officer or Contracting Officer Representative, or can another Government POC for the program who can verify the data be listed?

Response: So long as the individual has some official capacity with the project, yes.

- 67. Clarification:** GSA is requiring overall strict adherence to financial processes as well as financial audits. The salary band usage seems counter to other portions of the solicitation. Please provide clarity as to how industry is expected to maintain strict adherence yet use salary surveys that are non-consistent with audited processes.

Response: Offerors don't have to use anything provided with regard to pricing. We have simply provided what we are using as the basis for fair and reasonable pricing of ceiling rates to be used when adequate price competition does not exist.

- 68. Clarification:** Please clarify if the government expects offerors to provide the calculations (according to method found at L.5.3.1) that evidence the annual obligated and annual estimated values. If affirmative, please confirm that an excel format is acceptable for submission.

Response: Yes and yes.

- 69. Clarification:** Please confirm that a Table of Contents may be included for each of the 6 volumes at the option of the Offeror.

Response: Confirmed.

- 70. Clarification:** We have an awarded contract that we would like to use as a Relevant Experience Primary Project. Is proposal documentation/information permissible to verify OASIS Core Discipline areas?

Response: If the award documentation incorporates the proposal into the contract, then yes. Otherwise, we need the SOW, PWS, or solicitation document.

- 71. Clarification:** Adding the additional information under L.5 via Amendment 01 requiring all past performance to be a "PRIME" eliminated many quality firms from bidding the solicitation and left the very large firms that will meet the requirements. This is frustrating since the Draft GSA agreement did not include this language and it was not until amendment 01 to the solicitation that changed the entire submittal from the Draft.

We respectfully request that Section L.5 allow "subcontractor" past performance.

Response: Both draft solicitations included the requirement for all projects to have been performed as a prime contractor. The language was inadvertently included in a subsection in the original final solicitation, but the requirement has always been there. Additionally, we have been very clear regarding our intentions in this area for at least a year. The OASIS contracts have the ability to on-ramp. So while a firm may not be able to compete now, that same company will have a definitive idea of what it will take to be included on the contract in the future. This is not a one-shot opportunity. We will not accept subcontractor experience for a number of reasons, but we hope this clarifies matters. Thank you for sharing your opinion with us.

- 72. Question:** Under section L.5.1.9 dealing with the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, it talks about proposal "elements" in a few areas. Can you please explain what is meant by "elements" and where in the RFP we can identify the "elements" to ensure we include them in our Letter?

Response: "Elements" refers to any scored section of the RFP that the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters touch upon. For example, say you have a wholly owned subsidiary and you are using a relevant experience project (an "element") from that subsidiary. The MRCL should address and provide commitment of how that subsidiary will be utilized in the performance of task orders under OASIS SB. This could also apply to various systems or certifications, which are also proposal "elements". We hope this clears up the issue and thanks for the question.

- 73. Clarification:** In reference to L.5.1.9 of the subject solicitation, where an a Affiliate and Corporate Structure is defined, does a Joint Venture qualify as an affiliate to include relevant experience for the Prime Contractor. To clarify, does the JV past performance qualify as a past performance of the Prime Contractor if the Prime Contractor has over 50% ownership and manages the work performances, accounting, budgets, contracts, and staffing for all the contracts awarded under the JV?

Response: If the Offeror has ownership and control of a JV, the Offeror may use a Relevant Experience Project from the Joint Venture provided that a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter is provided that clearly articulates how that affiliate will be utilized in the performance of task orders under OASIS/OASIS SB. Additionally, proof of ownership will need to be provided as well.

- 74. Question:** Will the Government allow for supporting evidence that is classified "FOUO" to be submitted from our Government customer directly to the delivery location cited within the RFP?

Response: Yes. But please make sure the package is sufficiently marked to be included with your proposal, properly addressed, and arrives prior to the submission deadline. Additionally, you will need to supplement the provided information with some method of identifying the information contained (like identification of core disciplines). We will not read and search for the information.